

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20, 35-53, and 56-68 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 35 and 42 are the independent claims, each of which is amended.

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102(e)

Claims 1-20, 35-47, 50, 51, 56, 57, and 60-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0208493 A1 to Hall *et al.* (“Hall”).

### Independent Claims

As explained in the Amendment dated July 31, 2006, “the client does not necessarily have to access the server to instantiate the object. Rather, the client need only connect to the server to act on server data.” The client also does not necessarily have to access the server to populate data into the instantiated object, as discussed for example in paragraphs 0015-0018, where object data is populated on the client. *See also, e.g.*, the combination of claims 1 and 46 prior to this Amendment, where the data/content of properties are set prior to invoking a connect method to the business database on the server.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 35 to recite “setting of at least one property of ~~said~~ the instantiated company object on the client system with data from the client system...” Independent claim 42 is amended to recite “setting at least one property of ~~said~~ the instantiated company object on said computer system with data from the computer system...”. The Action cites Hall at paragraph 0068 as disclosing the setting step:

“the ObjSvr component 22 retrieves the ObjectDef class object and associated PropertyDef class objects from the ObjDef component 20, *instantiates an ObjectData class object and associated PropertyData class objects parallel to the structure represented by the ObjectDef and PropertyDef class objects*, retrieves the metadata 26, and returns the ObjectData and associated PropertyData class objects to the client application 16.” (emphasis on language cited on page 3 of Action)

Several distinctions are apparent between the claimed setting steps and that of Hall.

Hall is not setting content of the data class objects with content from the definition class objects -- he is only creating the structure of the data class objects in parallel to the definition class objects. As explained in paragraph 0067, “The ObjectDef-PropertyDef and ObjectData-PropertyData structures are parallel. The definition of an object is managed by the ObjDef

component 20 and stored in the ObjDef database.” The structure of the objects is not predefined on the client, but rather, is defined by a definition retrieved from the ObjDef database 24 via the ObjDef component 20 by the ObjSvr 22, necessitating such parallel instantiation.

Moreover, the amended claims emphasize that the setting step is performed upon the *instantiated* object. To whatever extent the instantiation operation Hall includes inheritance of data, the inheritance is by virtue of instantiation and not a step of setting a property of the *instantiated* object.

Moreover, when Hall defines data objects and populates the data objects with data, the definition and data is retrieved from the server as metadata 26 and data from data sources 14, (both of which are server-side data sources -- *see* Fig. 1). By contrast, the independent claims now explicitly state that the setting step on the client/computer system is performed “with data from the client/computer system”.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejections of amended independent claims 1, 11, 35, and 42 are requested. Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-10, 12-20, 36-41, 43-47, 50, 51, 56, 57, and 60-68 are also patentable, at least as further limitations on the independent claims.

### **Dependent Claims**

Regarding the company object in dependent claims 61, 63, 65, and 67, the Office Action cites Hall’s ObjSvr component 22 as anticipating the recited company object. As cited in the rejection of the independent claims, Hall states only:

“The client applications 16 are any code entity that either instantiates an ObjSvr component 22 or makes use of an existing instance of an ObjSvr component 22.”

Hall explains elsewhere however (for example in paragraph 0044) that objects are provided to the ObjSvr component 22 in accordance with metadata read from the ObjDef database 24 on the server by the ObjDef component 20. Thus, the ObjSvr component 22 does not suggest the limitations in claims 61, 63, 65, and 67 that “all business objects used by the external program/client system/computer system to access the business database exist as *predefined* component object model *objects on the client/computer system*.”

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claims 48, 49, 52, 53, 59 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0128400 A1 to Srinivasan *et al.* (“Srinivasan”). The combination of Hall and Srinivasan does not suggest overcoming the deficiencies of Hall discussed above with regard to the independent claims. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 48, 49, 52, 53, 59 and 59 are patentable, at least as further limitations on independent claims 1, 11, 35, and 42.

**Conclusion**

Based on these remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Applicant authorizes the Commissioner to charge any fees determined to be due with the exception of the issue fee and to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4209 to discuss any matter concerning this application.

Respectfully submitted,  
KENYON & KENYON LLP



David A. Klein  
Reg. No. 46,835

Dated: December 19, 2006

Kenyon & Kenyon LLP  
1500 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 220-4200  
Fax: (202) 220-4201